DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 427 HE 028 863

AUTHOR Goldsmith, Sharon S.
TITLE Beyond Restructuring: Building a University for the 21st Century. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 3 Nov 95
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (20th, Orlando, FL, November 2-5, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adoption (Ideas); College Administration; Educational Change; Educational Innovation; Educationally Disadvantaged; Ethnography; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; *Institutional Research; Multicultural Education; Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; Organizational Objectives; Participative Decision Making; Planning; Resistance to Change; School Organization; State Universities; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *California State University Monterey Bay; Organizational Analysis; Organizational Behavior; Organizational Culture; Organizational History; Organizational Structure

ABSTRACT

This ethnographic study of the creation of a new public university, California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB), highlighted the struggle of the founders to build a collective identity based on a distinctive vision for the 21st century. The original plan envisioned a model pluralistic academic community with a culture of innovation that included a mission to serve historically under-educated and low income populations, a commitment to multi-lingual and multi-cultural values, instructional innovation, and collaborative administration. Using participant observation, formal and informal interviewing, and content analysis, the study began with systematic collection of documents related to the founding of CSUMB in March of 1993, attendance at meetings at the planning office in 1993 and 1994, and appointment of the researcher to a post at CSUMB as visiting scholar. The focus of data collection and analysis was on how people transformed values into organizational realities. Analysis of the process unfolding at CSUMB found that the process resembled a dramatic play: first a period devoted to setting the stage, next a prologue, then Act 1 as key players and the growing cast of characters share the excitement of coming together for opening in the fall of 1995, followed by Act 2 and a sense of fragmentation as traditional patterns confront the CSUMB vision of non-hierarchical organization. The process of culture formation at CSUMB appeared to be a dynamic and fluid struggle to identify, acknowledge, define, and solve problems. An appendix contains a copy of the CSUMB vision statement. (Contains 65 references.) (JB)

ED 391 427

Beyond Restructuring:
Building a University for the 21st Century

Sharon S. Goldsmith

Division of Higher Education and Organizational Change
UCLA - Graduate School of Education and Information Studies

Visiting Scholar
California State University, Monterey Bay
100 Campus Center
Seaside, CA 93955-8001
(408) 582-3566
(805) 833-9042 (home)
E-Mail: sharon_goldsmith@monterey.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Association for the Study Higher Education, Orlando, Florida
November 3, 1995

HE 028 863

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Marriott Hotel, Orlando, Florida, November 2-5, 1995. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

Innovation and distinctiveness in higher education challenge prevailing norms and the habits of practice which pervade our organizational cultures. Internal and external demands for organizational change challenge leaders to go beyond restructuring or tinkering at the margins of our institutional life. The fragmented cultures of academic life and the dynamics of culture formation and change are critical factors in the change process. This ethnographic study of the creation of a new public university highlights the struggle of the founders to transcend the legacies of the traditional and build a collective identity based on a distinctive vision for the 21st century.

Beyond Restructuring: Building a University for the 21st Century

Introduction

The economic, social, and political environments of the late twentieth century create powerful pressures for fundamental changes in our institutions. There are persistent calls for restructuring the organizations which dominate our society. In order to succeed in the transformation of nineteenth century bureaucratic organizations into more adaptive and responsive institutions, it is increasingly important for leaders to understand the processes by which people create shared meaning in organizations. In public universities, demands for institutional accountability in an era of diminishing financial resources and increasing enrollments highlight a crisis of purpose which challenges prevailing educational philosophies and models of organization. While there is a growing body of scholarship on organizational culture in the private sector, there has been limited systematic study of organizational culture and change in higher education. Managerial approaches to organizational change which are based on experience and research in the competitive world of the marketplace do not translate well to the complex world of academia.

Although influenced by external realities and structural relations, organizational culture is fundamentally concerned with how people interpret symbols and make meaning within an organizational context. Academic culture is described as fragmented and dominated by the culture of academic disciplines (Dill, 1982; Clark, 1987; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988). A better understanding of the dynamics of organizational culture in universities may enable educational leaders to be more effective in efforts to change how universities work by increasing their understanding of how culture influences decisions.

In spite of the high value placed on inquiry and knowledge in the academy, universities and the people in them show a remarkable unwillingness to challenge the assumed validity of traditional organizational beliefs and values. This reluctance is reinforced by the prevailing positivist belief system which distances the observer from the observed. In higher education, when we objectify ourselves and our institutions as the subjects of inquiry, we make it more difficult to understand the dynamic processes by which we as human beings create and maintain the learning environments in which we live and work. It is important to better understand organizations known as universities as well as the people in them because the ways that we structure learning environments create the contexts for intellectual choice which both enable and constrain our thoughts and actions and ultimately influence both what we can know and what we can do with that knowledge.

By restructuring the systems and by redesigning and reinventing the institutions of higher education, managers may enhance resource allocation, accountability, and effectiveness (Benjamin & Carroll, 1993; Heydinger, 1994;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Marchese, 1995); however, fundamental and lasting change in higher education requires a willingness to reflect on those habits of practice, unexamined assumptions, and core values and beliefs which support the academic culture. The leadership challenge is to come to terms with the new realities of the twenty-first century and learn how to make meaningful changes within our universities.

This paper presents findings from several critical months of an ongoing ethnographic study of the process of building of a public comprehensive university for the twenty-first century. The paper is organized as follows: a discussion of organizational culture and change in higher education; an overview of the larger study; some preliminary findings in narrative form; discussion and conclusions; and additional questions.

Organizational Culture and Change

Organizational culture has become a dominant although frequently fuzzy concept in the study of organizations. "The current interest in using cultural perspectives to understand colleges and universities as organizations was fueled by the success of Japanese manufacturing firms in the 1970s (Kuh & Whitt, 1988). Cultural lenses reshape our ways of thinking of the academic enterprise in significant ways; however, the popularity of culture-based studies can also obscure the conceptual importance of a cultural perspective for how we understand our lives as people in organizations known as universities.

Organizational Culture

Culture is described as webs of significance, as the meanings ascribed to things and events by participants (Geertz, 1973). Organizations are abstractions: these collectivities are defined by the actions of people engaged in interdependent activity to achieve specific goals. Organization theory has traditionally focused on the abstraction within a discourse which privileges structure over human agency. Both theory and practice are better served when people are accounted for since human beings socially construct reality, make decisions, interpret the environment, believe and transmit sagas, provide or accept leadership, and promote or resist change. As Scott (1992) makes clear, "social actors are the instruments of both continuity - the reproduction of structure - and change - the production of novelty and innovation" (p. 19). The relationship between people and organizations is a dynamic process whereby contexts for choice are continually both maintained and reinvented.

A review of the extensive literature on organizational culture reveals confusion over its definition and use in research; however, the various definitions are dominated by a functionalist paradigm (Pondy, Frost, Morgan & Dandridge, 1983; Cameron & Ettington, 1989; Martin, 1992). Schein (1990) identifies three levels of culture: observable artifacts, values, and basic underlying assumptions.

Complex, invisible assumptions are deeply embedded in the organization and provide support for existing structures, policies, practices, and processes. Like societies, organizations have cultures which function to maintain norms and values. Organizational culture is also described as a mechanism for both external adaptation and internal social integration (Schein, 1985). A functionalist paradigm does not preclude change since organisms and organizations adapt continuously in order to survive; however, it influences what we know and how we know it. We ask how culture functions to maintain the organization: what are the pieces and processes at work?

While building on Schein's approach which is rooted firmly in structural-functionalism, Hatch (1993) offers a cultural dynamics model for understanding organizational culture which incorporates symbolic-interpretive perspectives of how meaning is made and defines culture itself as a process. In her cultural dynamics model, culture is understood as continuous cycles of action and meaning-making in combination with cycles of image and identity formation. This paradigmatic shift incorporates human agency and provides a cultural framework for understanding how people both maintain and change their contexts of choice as they interpret particular webs of significance. Hatch (1993) notes that "it is through culture that a person constructs the sense of individual and organizational identity and creates images that are taken for the self and the organization" (p. 681). Culture is an iterative process linking people to their organizations. Organizational culture cannot be understood without reference to the values, assumptions, habits, symbols, and traditions which give meaning to its interpretation by participants. However, organizational culture is an interpretive and powerful, dynamic process which reflects multiple realities and exposes the ideologies which give purpose to the actions of people in organizations. We seek to understand the multiple realities and ask whether our ideologies are appropriate: how might we hear, see, think, and act differently?

Organizational Change

In their review of organizational culture studies, Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) suggest that "the contemporary study of organizational culture is perhaps best understood as only the latest turn in the struggle between explicit and rational views of organization on the one hand and implicit, nonrational views on the other" (p. 462). They conclude that studies of planned change efforts do not support the belief that organizational culture can be easily manipulated as a rational tool of management. Schein (1985) cautions against oversimplified, prescriptive culture management strategies but in the end suggests that "we recognize that *the unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture*" (p. 317). Tierney (1988a) counsels researchers and practitioners to avoid using organizational culture as a new management approach to cure organizational ills and explain all things. So what, then, is the relevance of organizational culture to organizational change agendas?

When understood as a powerful internal dynamic which influences both continuity and change, organizational culture provides a conceptual bridge between agency and structure, between individual actors and the collectivity. The complexity of cultural analysis required by this model compels leaders and would-be change agents to look beyond articulated values, rational plans, and developmental scenarios in order to understand the change process. Gergen (1992) urges leaders and managers to expand their capacities to understand and incorporate alternative realities rather than forcing consensus. This approach also requires challenging prevailing functionalist conceptions of organizational culture with a critical perspective in order to "observe not only the constraints placed on the human will, but also the possibilities for action and change. . . . power, knowledge, ideology, and culture are inextricably linked to one another in constantly changing patterns and relationships" (Tierney, 1989, p. 29). Change does not then "occur because of heroic individuals, or because of rationally determined processes and goals. Instead, change takes place by the continuous interaction of structure and individual" (Tierney, 1991, p. 11). What becomes culturally and organizationally significant is the nature of this relationship and how people in organizations create and recreate meaning.

Academic Culture

Two consequences of incorporating people as significant social actors within the organization are to blur abstract boundaries and to recognize multiple realities. Organizational culture is only comprehensible in contexts which include what system theorists call the environment and what organization theorists call the organizational field. One context for universities is the national system of postsecondary education (Clark, 1987b). Becher (1989) and Bourdieu (1984/1988) provide rich studies of academic culture in Britain and France respectively. American academic culture has been explored by many scholars (Clark, 1987a, 1987b; Metzger, 1987; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Tierney, 1988a; Becher, 1989, and Austin, 1992). While recognizing that there are many cultures in universities including student and administrative cultures, this paper focuses on the faculty who are uniquely both products of universities and the primary means of production - the technical core of the academic workplace.

Clark (1987b) describes the academic profession as a loosely coupled array of varied interests. The profession is characterized by both fragmentation and integration making universities complex cultural mosaics. Scholars who attempt to describe and understand the workings of the American university have produced equally complex frameworks for analysis and elaborate typologies (Weick, 1976; Meyer & Rowan, 1978; Cohen & March, 1986; Birnbaum, 1988; Bergquist, 1992). Dill (1982) argues the importance of meaning making and organizational culture:

> The difference that makes a difference, then, about academic institutions is that they are value-rational organizations whose members are committed to,

> and find meaning in, specified ideologies. These ideologies are manifest in a symbolic life or culture at the level of the enterprise, the profession, and the discipline. (p. 310)

In her review of faculty cultures, Austin (1992) discusses four dominant cultures: disciplinary, institutional, national systems, and professional. The mosaic reveals multiple cultures:

> The several cultures or interpretive frameworks in which faculty live and work affect them in all they do as they organize and establish goals for their work, interact with students, balance their diverse responsibilities, participate in institutional affairs, and proceed through their careers. (Austin, p. 1615)

Kuh and Whitt (1988) describe culture as an invisible tapestry which reveals the nonrational aspects of academic organizations. A question persists: what are the values (rational or otherwise), assumptions, and ideologies by which people in universities understand their individual and collective identities?

There is no clear answer to this question although some academics have turned the mirror on themselves and their institutions. Considering the case of the American university, what do we know? Academic culture is both dominated and fragmented by disciplines (Clark, 1987a, 1987b; Becher, 1989). "There is no more stunning fact about the academic profession anywhere in the world than the simple one that academics are possessed by disciplines, fields of study, even as they are located in institutions" (Clark, 1987a, p. 25). Disciplines and disciplinary associations are powerful counterpoints to localized organizational culture. This is a fundamental distinction between universities and other organizations - a difference that makes a difference. Furthermore, discipline-based graduate schools are primary means of socialization for new faculty and, thereby, the way academic structures and values are reproduced. Within the modern research university, the hierarchy of disciplines is dominated by science and the rational, positivist, objectivist ideal. Weiland (1995) notes that within universities, not only do disciplines create boundaries, specialities within disciplines further fragment the culture.

What are the overarching beliefs and values which link faculty from various disciplines and in different institutions? Although about one-third of faculty surveyed did not think there were common values, Clark (1987a) identifies several common ideologies: pursuit of knowledge, intellectual integrity, and freedom and autonomy. Austin (1992) adds the commitment to serving society and collegiality. The academic profession is both fragmented and integrated: we live in different worlds and yet what we hold in common exerts a powerful norming influence. Common beliefs contribute to institutional drift as the pull of organizational isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) privileges dominant values and forms.

For the American university, these values include a positivist, objectivist view of truth where knowledge is based in the functionalist paradigm.

Organizational Change and Academic Culture

From a functionalist perspective, universities will either adapt to environmental changes or they will not survive. "The angst over higher education's future seems more pronounced than ever. Many institutions are working to implement changes. . . . Admirable efforts, but not enough. Twenty-first century higher education must become mission driven, customer-sensitive, enterprise-organized, and results-oriented" (Heydinger, 1994, p. 1). Calls for change are commonplace in the higher education literature (Bok, 1990; Boyer, 1990), and like their counterparts in business, leaders are looking at organizational culture as means to make change happen. Tierney (1988a) states that "the most persuasive case for studying organizational culture is quite simply that we no longer need to tolerate the consequences of our ignorance, nor, for that matter, will a rapidly changing environment permit us to do so" (p. 6).

Change is not new, and American universities have historically been remarkably responsive to social, economic, and political changes in their environments (Metzger, 1987). What has changed? The world we live in. Bennis and Slater (1968) call it the temporary society characterized by "temporary systems, nonpermanent relationships, turbulence, uprootedness, unconnectedness, mobility, and above all, unexampled social change" (p. 124). Drucker (1989) refers to new realities which will require a new world view where information is the organizing principle of production and there will be a new archetype of the educated person. Cameron and Tschirhart (1992) discuss the management challenge for higher education presented by a postindustrial environment of unpredictability, turbulence, resource scarcity, competitiveness. No sector of society is immune from fundamental changes: can American universities respond and remain viable and meaningful organizations?

Much of the skepticism regarding the adaptability of American universities is based on the high rate of failure for innovation in higher education although there are the exceptional institutions like Reed, Hampshire, and Evergreen State. As noted above, the common ideology of the academic profession exerts a powerful norming influence which gives presumed validity to what is. There is institutional drift within a fixed hierarchy, and there is also constant pressure to abandon innovation and revert to the traditional (Levine, 1980; Cardozier, 1993). Habit and practice - the way it is - are confused with effectiveness and quality. Curry (1992) notes that "the very independence and individualism that campuses embody make change difficult. Faculty, students, and staff . . . set rigorous standards for innovations that would change their community dramatically" (p. 47).

Postsecondary educational organizations respond in many ways to changes in educational philosophies and social demands (Riesman, Gusfield & Gamson, 1970; Clark, 1970/1992; MacDonald, 1973; Grant & Riesman, 1978; Levine, 1980;

Townsend, Newell & Wiese, 1992; Cardozier, 1993). The history of the American system of higher education is one of progressive change from elite colonial colleges with religious purposes to mass secular contemporary multiversities (Kerr, 1963, 1991; Metzger, 1987). Federal and state governments have been highly effective in using financial incentives and regulatory powers to influence the programs and priorities of higher education institutions. The diversity and vastness of the American system of higher education has shown flexibility and the ability to transform itself to meet the demands of a rapidly changing world. The coming transformation will likely produce very different organizations and ideologies.

In order to make fundamental and lasting changes in postsecondary educational organizations in the context of postindustrial society, we will need to change how we conceptualize and understand universities and the people in them. The very values, assumptions, purposes, ideologies which define the academic culture can also constrain our ability to adapt to rapidly changing demands. However, if we go beyond the functionalist paradigm, incorporate interpretive perspectives, and question critically the ideologies which prevail, we may discover that we have the capacity for fundamental change.

Contexts of Choice

Understanding organizational culture as a powerful dynamic which influences both continuity and change is a first step toward developing transformative leadership in higher education. It is fundamentally a question of purpose, and our ability to translate the common values of the academic profession into contemporary organizational realities. We must examine our own ideologies for relevance and rethink the organizational structures and processes which support the prevailing ideologies. One imperative is opening the boundaries of the organization, and another is to examine the borders we have created in our universities. Within academic culture, there are values and beliefs which can help to transform our institutions including collegiality, service, integrity, freedom, and community. Only we create and can change the contexts for choice in universities and build academic communities where multiple realities are valued and boundaries are blurred.

Ultimately it is the way we think about ourselves, our institutions, and our world which constrains our ability to act. It is first by seeing that we understand and can do. We need to recognize our individual and collective responsibility to create in the university an organization which enables people to connect with each other as we construct our new realities:

> We continue in our academic communities as democratic citizens involved in creating the hope that we have yet to realize. The fixed territories of home no longer exist, and yet we have one another with whom to build our academic communities of the next century. (Tierney, 1991, p. 158)

For higher education, the stakes are high, the time is short, and the internal and external demands for change are increasing. How do we transcend the prevailing norms and the habits of practice which pervade our academic and organizational cultures in order to be responsive to the challenges of the twenty-first century?

Marchese (1995) blames the system of higher education, and Benjamin and Carroll (1993) call more specifically for the restructuring of the governance system which allocates resources. The American system of higher education is highly complex and decentralized: change won't come quickly or easily. Leaders in higher education face a crisis of enormous proportions. The chancellor of the California State University and current chair of the American Council of Education Board describes the state of play as a triage environment (Munitz, 1995). Townsend, Newell, and Wiese (1992) comment on the value distinctiveness in institutions of higher education:

> Higher education is in need of visions. We urge educators - faculty, staff, administration, and system leaders - to commit to a cherished value or a compelling vision and then to articulate a purpose that challenges the commitment of others. The callings, causes, and cries that make up the innermost commitments of people can be come educational missions that chart new paths for higher education.
>
> A few groundbreakers are necessary to lead the way. These individuals plant the seeds of innovation and distinctiveness. Their labor bears fruit for all of higher education. (pp. 69-70)

Charting new paths, challenging the embedded assumptions of higher education, and sustaining the commitment requires women and men to take enormous personal and professional risks. This study is about some people who chose to try.

Building a New University

I suspect that there is not a university administrator or faculty member facing the challenge of organizational change who has not longed for a blank slate, a greenfield site - a place to start over. *If only* faculty were more responsive and better team players. *If only* administrators were more supportive of innovation and risk taking. *If only* the resources were available to do it right. *If only* students would see the benefits of a better way. What an opportunity that would be, to build a new form of university for the twenty-first century. Where would you start?

Building a distinctive public university at this time presents both the practical challenge of meeting external demands and the opportunity to introduce an alternative educational philosophy. Pressures for accountability challenge traditional patterns of operation: business as usual in higher education will not produce more adaptive organizations. Beyond the practical operational concerns

of efficiency and accountability, lies the larger question of purpose: what educational philosophy is articulated and how is that philosophy manifested in the processes and structures of the organization? Addressing both the practical and philosophical issues are two of the critical tasks before the people working to build California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) which declares itself in promotional literature to be "an institution of higher education daring to be different in concept and curriculum, focused on the needs of the 21st century."

The Study

This paper is a preliminary report from an on-going ethnographic study of the formation of organizational culture at a new public university which is being built around a distinctive educational vision. The purpose of this paper is to describe some of the contexts of choice within which the founding leadership group, staff, and faculty are struggling to create a distinctive organizational culture, a sense of community, and a collective identity during the early stages of institution-building. Creation of a strong shared culture is critical to the founding stage of a new organization and to its long-term adaptability and survival (Schein, 1983; Clark, 1970/1992). It is hoped that the larger study, which is my dissertation, and its examination of community and identity building will expand our understanding of the dynamic and complex process by which people in universities translate values into organizational realities.

Significance.

We understand little about the beginnings of the organizations which dominate our society. It is an important time in the development of an organization because it is during this stage that an idea takes substance and moves toward realization (Miles, 1980). We do not know much about the evolution of structures and processes in new organizations, but Miles and Randolph (1980) note that "what is known . . . is that choices made early in the development of organizations serve both to shape their enduring character and to constrain the range of options available to them in later stages of organizational life" (p. 45). Creation is when the process of making values real is most visible and meaningful for participants. Sarason (1974) notes that "studying the creation of a new setting is tantamount to studying the more implicit aspects of a culture as they interact with and determine the response to change" (p. 269). Cameron and Whetten (1984) call this the creation and entrepreneurial stage of the organizational life cycle which includes early innovation, niche formation, and creativity. Kimberly (1980) describes institutionalization as "that process whereby new norms, values, and structures become incorporated within the framework of existing patterns" (p. 31).

The importance of the founders in the creation of organizational culture is documented by Schein (1983, 1985, 1990). Furthermore, Schein (1985) notes that "cultures do not start from scratch. Founders and group members always have prior experience to start with. . . . The creation and embedding process, therefore,

has to be viewed simultaneously as a learning and a teaching process" (p. 221). The significance of founder impact has also been described in efforts to initiate distinctive organizational cultures in colleges and universities (Clark, 1970/1992, 1972; Grant & Riesman, 1978; Kimberly, 1980; Levine, 1980; Townsend, Newell & Wiese, 1992; Cardozier, 1993). Like founders, transformational leaders in higher education will require a more culturally sensitive understanding of the process of organizational change. Furthermore, this understanding must include both the legacies of the past and the contexts for choice in postindustrial society.

Methodology.

I began the systematic collection of documents related to the founding of CSUMB in March of 1993 and attended meetings at the planning office in 1993 and early 1994. In September of 1994, the provost appointed me visiting scholar shortly before the governor signed legislation officially establishing the university. Since then, I have conducted ethnographic fieldwork and informal interviews on a part-time and full-time basis having spent more than 130 days at the research site to date. The larger study will continue into 1996; however, the ethnographic data for this paper was collected primarily during the early months of 1995 - a critical time in the evolution of this university which included the physical relocation of planning activities to the campus site and the arrival of the founding president and the planning faculty. Guiding research questions at this stage were: (1) By what processes is organizational culture formed in a new and distinctive university? (2) What norms, beliefs, and shared meanings are articulated, and by whom, in the early stages of culture formation? (3) In what ways do participants engage with one another to create new definitions of self and community? For purposes of this paper, data sources include planning documents and early fieldnotes from participant observation. For the larger study, data analysis will be based more extensively on open coding of the ethnographic fieldnotes.

Ethnography helps "gain a perspective on the situation. Participant observation, formal and informal interviewing, and content analysis provide the ethnographer with a multitude of ways for understanding and describing the situation" (Tierney, 1988b, p. 25). The focus of data collection and analysis is on how people transform values into organizational realities. Ethnography also allows for the presentation of multiple voices and realities, identification of conflicting ideologies, and interpretive analysis of the consequences for participants and organizations. Schwartzman (1993) comments as follows on the particular value of an ethnographic approach to the study of organizations:

> It problematicizes the ways that individuals and groups constitute and interpret organizations and societies on a daily interactional basis. . . .
>
> Ethnography also requires researchers to examine the taken for granted, but very important, ideas and practices that influence the way lives are lived, and constructed, in organizational contexts. Because

> ethnographers are directed to examine both what people say and what people do, it is possible to understand the way that everyday routines constitute and reconstitute organizational and societal structures. (pp. 3-4)

As Lincoln (1985, p. 15) notes: "There must be some resonance between the world being studied and the methods being used to study it." At CSUMB, I have been referred to as "our external ethnographer" - a reference to the many ethnographers employed at the university. As an unpaid participant observer, I interact with faculty, administrators, and staff in a variety of settings and perform a variety of tasks. To most people at CSUMB, I am an old-timer. Some even persist in referring to me as their historian. I live on campus as a guest of very generous staff members, but return to my home on weekends. I have a remarkable degree of access and have achieved a good balance of being accepted as an insider and acknowledged as a researcher.

The Research Site

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB), the newest campus in a multi-campus system, opened to 652 students in August 1995. The idea for a new university was born in the community-based Fort Ord Reuse Group which had been formed in 1991 to oversee redevelopment efforts after the announcement by the Department of Defense that Fort Ord would close in 1994. In September 1992, the California State University opened a planning office in the city of Seaside where a small leadership group was assembled to develop the new campus. The office was initially staffed by a director of operations, planning, and development and an administrative services manager who were joined later by a senior secretary. In March 1993, the chancellor of the California State University appointed an interim provost to develop the academic program.

The initiative to create a new state university comes at a time of serious financial difficulty in California public higher education. The California State University is faced with the prospect of both a reduction in state funding for the system and an anticipated demand to accommodate an additional 180,000 students within the next twelve years. The establishment of the new campus is considered by many internal and external critics to be controversial. The chancellor sees it as an opportunity:

> Many observers and patrons believe that the traditional way of doing business in higher education is a thing of the past, or at least that fundamental patterns must be tested and altered. Today's economic, social, and political environments demand a new adaptability in how universities operate and a willingness to rethink the basic assumptions. (Munitz, 1993, p. 2)

The California State University has a long history of centralized, bureaucratic control and of domination by politicians and educational planners. Faculty in the system work under a collective bargaining agreement. In an era of drastically limited resources and cutbacks on existing campuses, securing the funding for a new and fundamentally different campus represents a high risk venture. There are also persistent criticisms of the last campus, California State University, San Marcos, which was established in 1988 (Tierney, 1993). The chancellor envisions CSUMB as a distinctive campus which is expected to adopt alternative organizational principles, develop and test innovative management strategies, and serve as a model for restructuring higher education (Munitz, 1993).

CSUMB is also part of a national process of converting the American defense establishment to domestic uses. It is a swords-into-plowshares conversion as part of a major military installation becomes a university. President Clinton dedicated the new university on Labor Day 1995. The campus consists of 1364 acres of the 28,000 acres which were Fort Ord Military Reservation. The transfer of the first parcel of land and facilities occurred on July 8, 1994, and Congress soon appropriated the first 29 million dollars for conversion. In spite of severe fiscal problems in the state, 9.3 million dollars were allocated for operations for 1994-1995, and on September 27, 1994, the governor signed legislation formally creating the new university. On October 20, 1994, the California State University Board of Trustees selected the founding president for CSUMB, and within two months the planning faculty were hired. CSUMB is an effort to model organizational change for other campuses by encouraging innovations and fundamental changes in how a public university is organized and in the educational outcomes produced. The early academic planning process which included internal and external constituents defined a distinctive vision calling for the creation of a model pluralistic academic community with a culture of innovation (see Appendix for Vision Statement).

Findings: A Drama Unfolds

Findings presented in this paper are partial and preliminary in the sense that the process of culture formation at California State University, Monterey Bay and this study are both ongoing. Space also does not permit an adequate discussion of historical and institutional contexts. In early 1995, the processes of community building and planning are chaotic and ambiguous, and the emerging collective identity seems elusive. CSUMB is a fragile enterprise as people struggle with what it means to become a model pluralistic academic community. The stresses and strains of change, innovation, and rapid growth combine with external pressures and the legacies of tradition to challenge faculty, staff and administrators to work through the chaos and come out the other side. The process is a dynamic and fluid struggle to identify, acknowledge, and solve problems. It is a learning process for dreamers and institution-builders as vision meets reality. It is also an

intense period of organizational learning situated in an evolving community of practice (Lave 1991).

Setting the Stage

On my first day as a visiting scholar at CSUMB in September 1994, I inquired at the planning and development office for an organization chart. The office staff were not sure there was such a thing, and so I was given a one-page list of names and phone numbers to use. The next day I asked the provost for an organization chart, and he said there was one in the business plan packet which had been prepared for the Board of Trustees, but he added:

> As you'll see, the organization charts are still hierarchical. I'm not satisfied with them. It is hard to get them to think in terms of a flatter organization - they focus on hierarchy. The reporting lines also aren't right yet.

The provost was right, the charts were traditional hierarchies - three of them - all reporting to the chancellor's office.

Accepting his appointment in October 1994, the founding president said of the high quality of preplanning and early development work: "All that does is get us the right, the responsibility, the opportunity to begin to design a university, and this university has not been designed." In his initial press conference, the president explained why he accepted this position:

> I believe that California State University at Monterey Bay has the potential - and I underscore the word potential - to be the single most important development in American higher education today. CSUMB is above all else an opportunity to help design and lead the first 21st century university in America. . . . The job is to create a new institution which is second to none and an institution which integrates the best of our new practices, but if this institution is going to be successful as an organization, it is going to have to be an organizational climate and an organizational culture which is as appropriate to the 21st century as the historic community of scholars was to the 19th and 20th centuries. If we cannot make that happen, we will run the risk of substituting a new orthodoxy for the old and missing the chance to build a bold new university form.

The original team of planners had formed a virtually seamless group which worked from offices in Seaside, but during the second half of 1994, the personnel and the problems grew rapidly. The setting was chaotic; processes and policies were ambiguous. In September, the provost told me:

> Things have come so far, it has a momentum all its own. You have to understand how far we've come and the crises we've gone through already

> just to get to this point in order to put today's little crisis in perspective. . . . My strength is having a high tolerance for ambiguity and change. It is necessary in this environment to take away the blame. It is important to "balance - on the one hand, the vision of what we're working for and then the practical aspects of the situation. I have to constantly adjust the balance.

The pace of change, the multiplying of people, and the relentless ticking of the academic year clock make adjusting the balance an organizational struggle. The rapidly changing context for action complicates the process of making values real, and crises little and large are ever present as the drama unfolds.

Prologue

It is 1995 - a new year and yet another beginning for the people building a distinctive public university for the 21st century in the sand dunes overlooking Monterey Bay. A fierce winter storm rages along the California coast as people who have left familiar homes, positions, and communities pass by the sentry guarding the remains of Fort Ord Military Reservation - pulled by a vision and the challenge of building a better place. It is a time for bold dreams and facing realities, for human creativity and confronting obstacles, for enthusiasm and struggle, and for going into the chaos and coming out the other side. As Sarason (1972) observes:

> Creating a setting is one of man's most absorbing experiences, compounded as it is of dreams, hopes, effort, and thought. In the lives of individuals, few things rival their participation in the creation of a setting for poignancy, memories, and meanings. (p. 272)

The process is at once complex, chaotic, and compelling. It is both collective and individual as people come together to build a distinctive university and to establish a new sense of self and community. The task before them is not a simple one, for as Clark (1970/1992) explains:

> What is so difficult, so hard as to occur infrequently, is to put it all together: to realize the necessity of a unifying theme; to formulate one feasible in a given social context; to build the organizational conditions and structures that allow and help a mission to get under way; and to develop and continue the structures that elaborate a mission into a rich and encompassing definition of the institutional self. (p. 236)

In the words of the provost, it is time to "trust in those who drink the water and risk their hair glowing in the dark."

Any journey involves destinations, starting points, and modes of transportation, and when the journey involves many people there are different

understandings of how best to get to where they are going. People also have different reasons for making the journey and different conceptual starting points: there are many beginnings. The founding president of CSUMB puts it this way at the first orientation meeting for planning faculty: "We will be beginning this place again and again. We need to be smart and sensitive over the next year. We have to hold on to progress and bring others in to help build a community of people." For the original planning team, beginnings reach back many months or even years, and for others this is a transition from military service to a new form of public service. A local city councilwoman comments that closing Fort Ord is like "closing a chapter of my life" telling the newcomers that it "was a post of compassion for minorities and for children with disabilities. It was an employer and provided many starts." So where does this story begin? That depends: there are many starting points and many legacies for CSUMB. Creating something new, different, better, pulls people forward toward the future. This future is represented for people at CSUMB by the Vision Statement. Its challenge is full of meaning for surrounding communities, for powerful external constituencies, and for the people who risk their personal and professional lives to struggle to make its values real. The vision permeates conversations at CSUMB. The vision which was first articulated about 18 months ago was crafted by the provost using an interactive process which included a variety of constituencies including external consultants and advisory groups. Its language is infused in the university's promotional and recruitment materials. Key values in the Vision Statement include: service through high quality education; substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community; a culture of innovation; value and cultivate creative and productive talents of students, faculty, and staff; integrate the university community across staff and faculty lines; and build a model pluralistic academic community.

This journey has a larger political, social, and organizational context. The compelling vision of a university for the 21st century is also a challenge to the prevailing values and traditions of higher education. A representative of the regional accrediting body warns:

> Your vision statement contains ideas that have tweaked every part of the educational establishment. . . . Cover your rear ends. Your future is at stake. From today, you should be devoted (1) to improve the means to meet goals and (2) to defend the legitimacy of the institution.

An external critic refers publicly to CSUMB as a "political pork barrel run by self-styled educational reformers . . . [which is] destructive of quality and access and seriously undercuts pleas for dollars." There is a sense that the world is watching, and perhaps this sense is heightened my presence as an observer. This journey is about the process of making values real. In the words of an academic dean, it is about how to "get to tomorrow, . . .[and] create the culture we want." The process

is dynamic, occurs in a shifting context, and involves a growing number of diverse people: it is complex, chaotic, and compelling. The beginning for this story is January 1995.

The Curtain Rises on a Place Reborn

Entering the main gate from Highway 1 to reach the campus of CSUMB, I pass under the imposing gateway sign which still reads "U.S. Army - Fort Ord" although the base was officially decommissioned on September 30, 1994. I approach the stone gatehouse where a uniformed sentry inspects vehicles for proper identification. My purple and white CSUMB parking permit has expired with the old year so the sentry tells me that I have one week to get a new one before signaling that I may proceed. The permit becomes my priority. I turn left to reach the main campus area of CSUMB and eventually find my way to the newest of the three occupied buildings on campus. I am speaking to a staff member in the provost's office when a newly arrived planning faculty member appears. I agree to show her around and help her find her office. We start with parking permits.

The storm has relented which allows us to walk around, and on the tour she confides: "I don't know anyone." We have difficulty finding her office which is not where her map indicates. When we do find it, I introduce her to the dean of academic planning, instruction, and assessment. Several other planning faculty are finding their way to this dean's office looking for directions, information, or introductions. Thirteen planning faculty are doubled and tripled up in offices which have desks and chairs but apparently no phones or computers. As I leave to find a place to work, I ask the staff person near the dean's office for a faculty orientation schedule and find there isn't one. Of course, even if there were one, as a staff person said last fall when she first moved to campus: "Our motto here - and we should just put it right on the front door - is 'Everything here is subject to change'."

The conveyance of property from the Department of Defense to the California State University includes 1364 acres, 1253 housing units, and 260 other buildings. Almost all of these buildings are long abandoned and boarded up. Military insignias and mottos are reminders of the 77 years that this place was the site of a major military installation. The sand dune landscape seems littered with buildings of various styles and vintages including old wooden buildings which will be torn down. There are wide open areas which have not been maintained and scattered clumps of pines and the cypress trees so familiar in the Monterey area. Three miles east of the main campus area out Inter-Garrison Road (also known as 3rd Street) and situated on rolling dunes covered with scrub oaks are the university housing units of Schoonover Park and Frederick Park. These duplex, triplex, and quadriplex units along with parks and walkways are arrayed on winding streets and cul-de-sacs. Some units are still occupied by Department of Defense personnel; some are occupied by the growing university community; and many others are

boarded up and home to scavenging wildlife - particularly skunks. To the west is Monterey Bay, and to the east, the fields of the Salinas Valley.

The planning office for CSUMB was located for more than two years in Seaside, but now for the first time, all CSUMB personnel are located on the campus. The first two buildings in use on campus are located at the corner of 3rd Street and 3rd Avenue and have eleven separate modules with offices in the front and open warehouse areas in the back which had been used to issue ammunition. Many still contain security rooms or vaults with bars on doors and internal windows. Work is underway to renovate these warehouse areas for use by the faculty, but they are far from ready. It takes only days for the faculty to lay claim on their preferred office space and for staff to be shifted to new locations. It takes longer for phones and computers to be operational.

The newest building is a converted dental clinic and is located up the hill from the module buildings on 4th Avenue. Between 4th and 6th Avenues is a cluster of white buildings with tile roofs which will be converted into the offices and classrooms of the central campus by the time students arrive in August. On the corner of 3rd Street and 6th Avenue is the "Fort Ord Holiday Inn" which will become the freshman residence hall. Located to the south on 6th Avenue is the Bayview Chapel which is used for larger university meetings. The main area of the chapel has pews arranged in a near semi-circle facing the pulpit or speakers area which is illuminated with authority. Overhead is a high, pointed ceiling with a skylight at the top which reminds those assembled of the winter storm raging outside during many of the university meetings held here.

Of the persistent rain, one faculty member says: "My rural roots tell me rain is California gold." For another faculty member, whose cars, papers, and personal belongings are claimed by the flooding Carmel River, the storm has another meaning. She, her companion, and two cats spend the night in a shelter and weeks later move to campus - after the provost intercedes to overrule the controversial "no pets" policy of the housing office. It is a policy destined to be rescinded. As a staff person says: "We are inviting these people to come here and asking them not to bring the furry members of their families!" Some simply ignore the policy while others fight to change it. After a welcome reprise in February, March brings yet another winter storm, and the Salinas River flood and major road closures briefly turn the Monterey Peninsula into "Monterey Island" accessible only by air.

The Key Players and a Growing Cast of Characters

Women and men come to CSUMB, to this fort turned campus, from very different worlds. The challenge of creating something better and the vision of a distinctive university bring together an enthusiastic and diverse collection of individuals. They have a wide variety of personal and professional histories as well as agendas. Classes begin on August 28, 1995, and facilities must be renovated, equipment purchased, policies and procedures developed, roles and responsibilities clarified, curriculum planned, students admitted, and additional faculty and staff

hired. Together they will build this university and, in the process, create a culture, a community, an identity for CSUMB.

The Executive Dean.

One of the original planning team members, the former director of operations, planning and development is now executive dean at CSUMB. His responsibilities include human resources, procurement, budget and finance, facilities planning, and campus security. Retired from the army where he once served as a garrison commander at Fort Ord, he is an energetic and enthusiastic man with a commanding voice and ready smile who frequently seems to be having altogether more fun doing this than anything - except playing golf. People like him, and he has a keen sense of the past and vision of the future campus. His staff includes two other members of the original planning team: a senior secretary who previously worked in the public relations office at Fort Ord and an administrative services officer who has twenty-one years of experience in the California State University.

The Provost.

The provost is considered the primary architect of the Vision Statement, is deeply committed to serving the community, and says of himself: "I am an anthropologist and have a lifelong commitment to the CSU as an egalitarian institution." His feelings are often expressed as "we are realizing the dream" or "the dream is becoming reality." The provost was raised in a small town in the Southern San Joaquin Valley - the youngest son in a large family who worked in the fields. He served that town as a police officer while attending the local community college, received degrees from California State University campuses at Fresno and Sacramento, and completed his doctorate at Stanford University. The values of his rural roots are as strong as his passion for sailing his boat in Monterey Bay. The provost served the university system as an executive fellow working with the chancellor, but he has also been a faculty member and dean. As provost, his vision of the future extends effortlessly into the next century.

The President.

The founding president is known as an educational innovator and politician although he describes himself as "one of those for whom term limits was not necessary." Young and energetic, the president is also consistent and unrelenting in his focus on learning outcomes and assessment:

> Before disciplines, before courses, before technology, there are two touchstones: (1) What must they learn and know? Be clear about how success is defined as learning, growth, and change in people.
> (2) Assessment: how do we - and they - know they're there?
> Knowing what you know is the starting point of lifelong learning.

The president comes from a wealthy New England family and was educated at elite schools - Phillips Academy, Princeton, and Harvard. At the age of 25, he was the founding president of a community college serving nontraditional students in Vermont. In addition to his political career, the president has worked in the areas of policy and financing of higher education and was the dean of a school of education and human development.

The Planning Faculty.

An advertisement appeared on June 8, 1994, in The Chronicle of Higher Education for ten multidisciplinary faculty. Seeking "creative, dynamic vanguard faculty of wide diversity, with successful multidisciplinary experience," the new campus received approximately 3000 applications. After an extensive screening process involving faculty and students from other California State University campuses and community representatives, thirteen planning faculty accepted offers of tenured full professorships beginning January 1995. While many planning faculty are present full-time in early January, others must combine work here with wrapping up obligations at their previous institutions. The advertisement which appears on February 3, 1995, in The Chronicle of Higher Education for next round of 20-25 "pioneering" multidisciplinary start up faculty results in nearly 5000 applications.

The thirteen planning faculty include eight women and five men: six Caucasians, four Latinos/Latinas, two Asian-Americans, and one African-American. Three faculty each come from the arts, education, and social sciences, and the other four are in computer science, telecommunications, science, and humanities. Four are from other California State University campuses, six from other universities, and one each from a private arts college, an international research institute, and performing arts. Early on, the planning faculty expand their ranks to fifteen by making two additional planning faculty hires with expertise in science policy and telecommunications: two men - one Caucasian and one Native American.

For most of the planning faculty, January 1995 is the first time they meet, and many are busy settling into new homes on campus, finding schools for their children, arranging for cable service, waiting for furniture, and learning the wonders of state bureaucracies from the university to the Department of Motor Vehicles. They are fifteen creative scholars who have teaching, research, and service interests as varied as integrated aquaculture systems, multimedia applications, public art, applied ethics, critical thinking, theoretical foundations of multicultural education, addictive behaviors, and the role of fathers in parenting. One misses New York bagels; another spins beautiful and humorous metaphors; one grows impatient with the endless meetings; and another actually bets against the UCLA basketball team. The planning faculty also have agendas, build alliances, sometimes revert to discipline-speak, and employ various strategies to position themselves in their new environment.

The Rest of the Cast.

Deans and other academic administrators recruited primarily from other parts of the California State University constitute the academic affairs council. The rapidly growing support staff has been recruited primarily from the local tri-county region although some of the senior staffers are from other California State University campuses. By January 1995, total CSUMB personnel number about 80. Although no students are present, their admission and imminent arrival is a presence felt by all. The 5000 student applications far exceed the capacity for this year which creates a serious enrollment management problem. With limited residence hall space and faculty resources, only about 633 full-time equivalent students at all levels will be admitted for fall semester 1995. The greatest number of applications are from first-time freshmen, and the large number of transfer applications are mostly from nearby community colleges. For this year, post-baccalaureate admissions will be limited primarily to the teacher credential program although other graduate programs are planned for the future.

Act One: Coming Together

When asked by the provost to say why they are here and how they feel about it at their beginning in early January 1995, the planning faculty respond with passion, faith, and commitment. After an endless Thursday morning of orientation to forms and procedures, several of the newcomers respond:

> How many times in your lifetime do you get a chance to build something new?
>
> I am blissful. This is not a place that just tolerates diversity but sees it as enrichment - that understands and means it. I had a visceral reaction to the vision statement. . . . It is going to be wonderful. . . . I am joyful to be here.
>
> My attitude is to have long term goals to get away from structural orientation. I came from the oldest CSU to the newest. There we had to fit into a culture, into the constraints of what they want. Here we're building a culture. It's the chance of a lifetime.
>
> The vision is everything I have been struggling to see happen. An institution with diversity at the ground level. A place God could get tenure even with only one book. And service which is the reverse of all institutions. And connections with the community.
>
> I see Monterey Bay as a Mecca and desire to work together to build a good community here that will enable us all to take risks and come out okay. This is fundamentally important, and if we do it, others will come.

Sitting beside me is a candidate for a position on the planning faculty who listens to the self-introductions of administrators and faculty and comments: "If this is my first date, I sure hope you will call me tomorrow." The vision is seductive.

The following Tuesday at Bayview Chapel at the first academic planning workshop, the provost asks the five planning faculty who have just arrived to say "who you are, where you are from and your thoughts and feelings about being here", and they respond:

> I want an opportunity to address issues with relevance in the real world and instill the drive, intuition to learn themselves in students.
>
> People in higher education fear diversity. . . . We need to work to come together in problem solving.
>
> Here the starting point is where most institutions will not get to in our lifetime. It is inspiring. I think this isn't real.
>
> Happy to be here within the walls of the university. The chapel is spiritual, transformative.
>
> This is a new era, part of the future. We need human computer chips, to integrate on a cultural level. Anyone in California has multiple cultures, and fusion means take that energy and build something new - vibrant and electric. . . . We all must be willing to learn new things.

And there is much to be learned.

The provost asks deans and directors to set the tone for the faculty and "make them feel special." The provost repeatedly protects their time so that faculty can focus on the priorities which he has set for them: curriculum development, faculty hiring, governance, and only then other creative activities. To the faculty, the provost says:

> Talented people are here, and leadership is shared. Assumption is there is power in the tenured full professors. They are the center. They have significant control of academic policy, curriculum, and personnel. . . . Founding group sets procedures which cycle after cycle form basis of socialization. In the culture there is no single more powerful role. It is not accidental. We trust you, have confidence in you. Use the power wisely, share it, blur some of the boundaries. . . . Community building here is everyday activity. Commit to the idea. Start with how we treat one another - everybody.

The planning faculty are special, powerful, protected, and also isolated from the central process of institution-building. One faculty member is concerned:

> Faculty must get involved. I disagree with some of [the provost's] concern for protecting faculty. They need to understand the context in which they're working. Otherwise, polarization will occur, and then it's over. And, there are several of this faculty who are so inclined now.

When the organizational model is first presented to the planning faculty, it is described this way by the dean in charge of academic planning: "This will be a horizontal, flat organization, communal by nature. Five deans with centers and the institutes will be interdisciplinary and will come and go. There is no equivalent in a traditional setting." He tells faculty that they will work in two or three institutes, and that "we have the ability to create, enhance, expand, kill institutes" and asks faculty to "think in big and flagrant ways. Turn the chart sideways if you want. This is in raw form - as far as we can take it. Now it needs faculty input."

The vision pulls the process forward, but the pressures of the present are enormous as practical, real time decisions must be made: the work load is tremendous; the hours worked long and difficult; the atmosphere tense. A few weeks later, the president implements an institutional planning process saying:

> Look, we have no history, no basis for shared assumptions, no infrastructure - formal or informal, no policies and practices . . . and multiple planning activities. It is confusing and for good reason. We need to create formal and informal organizations which create the culture. It goes on and on creating a process. . . . It is about how we evolve over the next 6-8 months when the die is cast. . . . We need one flavor, one core set of values.

There is resistance in the faculty ranks to what one member calls a "sterile process" which inhibits creativity, but in the end they agree with another colleague who says: "We have to try." Faculty vote easily to invite the faculty union in, but they resist the provost's repeated calls for faculty status and tenure for several academic administrators.

Meetings abound. The president's leadership team meets weekly, and the academic affairs council meets once or twice a week. Joint meetings between academic administrators and the "other side of the house" - administration, headed by the executive dean - are held every other week for cross sharing information. There have developed very separate domains for administrative and academic concerns, and information does not flow easily from the leadership team. Some units have staff meetings which involve support staff who otherwise are rarely included in the conversation. At their off-site, closed retreat on January 25, the faculty organize themselves into subcommittees. Faculty generally meet as a committee of the whole three times each week: Monday on curriculum for six

hours, Tuesday on other business for three hours, and Wednesday on personnel issues with the provost for two hours. There are myriad task forces and work groups devoted to such things as facilities, enrollment management, technology, and service learning. Then there is the strategic planning meeting where "we talk about what we're going to talk about" according to one dean.

The president hosts informal get-togethers on Thursday afternoons and brown bag discussions for faculty and administrators to meet with visitors invited to campus to share their expertise. A dean organizes Indiana Jones "effortless sociability" sessions for people to share their adventures in coming to CSUMB only to have the name changed to the Amelia Earhart Search Party in the interest of gender equity. There are several university events where people from the larger campus community as well as from nearby cities are invited: the Martin Luther King celebration, the service learning conference, the watershed project conference, and the observance of the birthday of Cesar Chavez.

Act Two: Pulling Apart

There is a great deal of talking, but it is fragmented. I increasingly hear phrases like "saying it won't make it happen" during and between meetings and sense a growing disconnect between rhetoric and reality. At times there is a tone of bitterness in the conversation, and accusations and counterattacks threaten personal and professional relationships. Lines are being drawn in the sand dunes. "People do what they're used to doing" says an academic administrator concerned with faculty behaviors. One dean comments: "We're all struggling with the legacy of the traditional organization", and another laments about faculty: "Regardless if they wanted out of the box, they come here with three sides." The provost observes: "There is lots of ambiguity and some testing. Trying to bring old ways with them." Old ways of dividing the academic community into adversarial positions of faculty versus administrators translate into behaviors at odds with the vision of blurring boundaries and creating a horizontal organization with shared leadership. The arrival of the planning faculty has brought on a severe case of "them and us" mentality. It is a crisis of meaning.

The way that conversations are organized reinforces traditional divisions. There is little sustained effort to create shared experiences and develop common meanings. Referring to the faculty, a dean makes it clear:

> They have gone down the path a long way. We thought it would be us. Now, it's them and us. Two said about the flat organization that "we're not sure we want the administration involved." They are on their own path, and we're on our path. They have gone their own way in that direction. . . . We have been out of the conversation.

The planning faculty turns inward and organizes itself into committees to design the curriculum, and five or six curriculum clusters emerge along with a list of

possible majors. These curriculum clusters differ from the specialty clusters identified in the Vision Statement, and there is also confusion about how they would interface with the five centers and the deans. The faculty's list of majors does not correspond to the majors preapproved for the campus by the California Postsecondary Education Commission and distributed to the public. The provost warns deans and directors:

> The situation contains ambiguity and danger. We want not too much structure, hierarchy. We will struggle with it. Sometimes things won't be very clear. We need openness, truth telling, and communication to be different than where we came from. It's a power sharing approach that will be tested.

There is no trust and no common language developing, and a dean's frustration shows: "We want to be different. If we're going to do it, get it started. I feel outside."

By February, building the community and creating the culture are viewed as serious problems, and the provost seeks ways to reassert his authority and to come to consensus telling deans and directors:

> Management responsibilities are around this table. The buck doesn't pass from this group. The function hasn't shifted. How do we do it? Not create hierarchy but create community. I know we're all so busy. Meet with me. Let's have a retreat to clarify things. On personnel, we may hire 20, and there is jockeying for position. As we develop this institution, . . . faculty recommend and administrators appoint. The president delegates to the provost, and I share it with you.

A month later, faculty vote to call a mini-retreat to clarify the relationship between deans and the curriculum clusters and to define the organizational structure. The faculty member who proposes the retreat says: "For voice, we need to come together. All are faculty and must come together around what is best for the institution. These are political and touchy issues, but it has to be resolved." A dean responds: "It is indeed a touchy point. We are at a crossroads and need a dialog about moving this institution to be collaborative, inclusive, blurring distinctions. Need to get clarity." The result is a stand-off agreement. Later, the provost tells deans and directors that there is a lot of work to do on the organization of centers, institutes, work groups, and majors in order to be clear - otherwise "we are in trouble and it leads to factionalism." He has deans rewrite their job descriptions in an effort to clarify responsibilities and tells them that clarity and common meanings must be developed together "so we are not waking up in the middle of the night with the sweats." To which, another dean replies: "Who sleeps?"

In the chaos, amazing things do get done. The arrival of 400-500 construction workers to begin renovation of the central campus and freshman residence hall is imminent. Major decisions are coming on admission of the first group of students. Everyone anxiously awaits the results of curriculum planning as faculty struggle to complete the "very drafty draft." Planning faculty are consumed with reviewing thousands of applications for start up faculty hires. Collaborative arrangements are negotiated and implemented with educational partners in the region. People are hired, and a few leave to return to campuses from which they were on loan to CSUMB. The president promises a real budget and budget process soon. On his resignation and retirement, the chief financial officer reminds everyone: "The world is watching." The president assigns his duties to the executive dean in the hope of getting progress on the budget. The provost suggests that there may be other departures: "There may be more coming. This is a dynamic organization. We need to have an administrative team that is cohesive. Some fit, and some don't support innovation."

On the giant wall calendar in the faculty meeting area in the back of the academic affairs module, August 28 has a target on it, and each day that passes is marked off. A university party hosted by the president on March 31, 1995, is a salute to the "old timers" - meaning those who were here before September 30, 1994. Staff receive certificates indicating they are part of the "team of dreamers," and the original planning group receive plaques acknowledging their contributions. Accepting his plaque, the provost says simply: "Community, community, community." In spite of advance notice from the president's office, few planning faculty attend this party. It suggests an emerging culture which is fragmented and where distinctions between people are drawn rather than blurred. Act III awaits the arrival of the second phase faculty and the students.

Discussion and Conclusion

California State University, Monterey Bay is a fragile enterprise as it struggles with what it means to become a model pluralistic academic community. The stresses and strains of change, innovation, and growth challenge people to work through the chaos. Not an inherently rational, linear process, there is passion, energy, intelligence, vision and also doubt, fear, pain, and conflict. There are whispers of wounds in the organization: "Wounds. There are a lot of wounds around here - scratch the surface, and they're there." One person, near tears, laments: "It was supposed to be different here." Another worries that her child will blame her for coming to this place where she is so unhappy. Under stress, some wonder quietly if this experience is worth the sacrifices of family: "How much can I take from them?"

The planning faculty has conceptualized the learning process for students as a spiral beginning with self, moving out to family, then to community, and then to

the global community. In much the same way, the people in the new university are searching for the language to connect themselves with the evolving collective identity. This learning process is both public and private, collective and individual. It is harder on some than on others. Sarason (1972) sees this time as an obstacle course for leaders who must try to find both the wisdom and consciousness to handle disillusionment:

> It will be a wisdom that acknowledges reality without sacrificing dreaming, that distinguishes and confronts the conflicts between the realities of social organization and the needs of individuals, that does not confuse what people are with what one wants them to be, that does not confuse what people are with what they always will or have to be, and that does not leave to a benevolent future the task of healing present unpleasantries. Finally, it will be a wisdom that will not tolerate the fantasy of perfection. (p. 204)

The uneasiness and anxiety of people engaged in the complex process of building this new university are heightened by the compressed time frame available to accomplish the task. A senior administrator laments: "Every night when I go home I feel like I've failed. There is too much stress and individual attempts at triage. . . . What we need is another year to do this, but we don't have it." In hindsight, a staff person reflects: "I would have hired two therapists for people to talk to, to vent - and not have it discussed over lunch." It is the intensity of the personal sacrifices and unpleasantries which is missing from historical accounts or memoirs of the process of building new organizations. People have come together unprepared, and there is no time for rehearsals and rewrites.

The values of the CSUMB vision have not yet been made real and translated into language and behaviors that support a community based on self-reflection and trust: it is an ongoing process. Tierney (1993, chap. 7) suggests five organizational ideas for building communities of difference: create a framework for diversity, initiate structures for developing voice, implement alternative structures of learning, develop assessment as a formative activity, and reconsider promotion and tenure. All five of these ideas involve concrete structures, strategies, and policies which address issues of voice and power in organizations. While some of these issues have been raised at CSUMB, there remain many questions that have not been asked, and the campus remains a work in progress. The people of CSUMB will decide together what constitutes a model pluralistic academic community and then build out the organization. To use an often repeated phrase: "We are not there yet."

Structure and Power.

There exists an aversion to structure which identifies structure with hierarchy, bureaucracy, and the traditional organization. About the flat organization, one faculty member says: "I don't have a problem with structure. We

need some peaks in the flat structure. Structureless, we ain't." The aversion appears rooted in the distinction traditionally made between agency and structure where agency represents individual freedom and creativity, and structure represents oppression and bureaucratic rules. Only when this distinction is replaced by a duality where structure is understood as being both constraining and enabling of action can it become a positive within the organization (Giddens, 1979, chapt. 2). The challenge becomes the creation of appropriate and enabling structures which reinforce and help to build the culture and the collective identity. At some point, processes become institutionalized as structures which frame the abstraction known as the organization. In order to understand structure as enabling as well as constraining, there needs to be a clear understanding of power in the organization. Otherwise, the more things change, the more they remain the same, and values remain rhetoric because "saying it doesn't make it happen."

In November 1994, at his first official deans and directors meeting, the president commented: "We are used to being marginalized. We are the institution now." This phrase speaks both to legacies of power relationships in traditional universities and to the challenge to those who would now be the university to redefine essential relationships. There are concerns for power and voice in the Vision Statement; however, the values of the horizontal organization, shared leadership, and blurring distinctions between faculty and staff remain in the realm of ideology. The emergence of traditional power dynamics is reflected in many behaviors including controlling information, silencing voices, testing limits, challenging authority, invoking of disciplines and status differentials, and forming defensive subcultures or cliques. There is little sense of safety or trust which is a poor foundation for community. Negative power surfaces, and conflicts become a crisis in leadership. People complain about "two cultures - maybe three - here" and ask "who is in charge?"

Making values real is a process which requires confronting the ideologies which people bring to the new organization if people aspire to break out of the box and challenge the unexamined assumptions of the past. Otherwise, the voices heard in the organized conversations will be the same ones, new structures will be built on old assumptions, and a new orthodoxy will replace the old. It is one thing to value shared leadership and blurred distinctions, but when people from the margins move to positions traditionally associated with power, what processes and structures make it happen? Who decides, who governs? The provost comments: "This role ambiguity is destructive. How we come to consensus is key."

Community and Multiple Realities.

The desire for consensus reflects the traditional, rational paradigm which dominates institutions of higher education. Tierney (1993) describes the modernist ideal: "Consensus is achievable. A community functions around norms. Ultimate truths exist" (p. 140). I do not yet know whether the people forming the culture of California State University, Monterey Bay will challenge this ideal. Is coming to

consensus understood as building a community with one voice, based on shared vision and common meanings? Or is the goal of this model pluralistic academic community to build a community of difference which allows for multiple meanings and a continual process of redefinition? Which type of community supports a culture of innovation?

The evolving political and ideological decision making process will cast the die for the new university. As a faculty member observes: "At some point, the cheese has to start binding." Making values real at California State University, Monterey Bay is a process and a journey which will begin again and again. It is about the questions asked, the voices heard, and the values around which conversations are organized. If the stresses and strains, the risks and emotions, the vision and action combine to produce a strong organizational culture which supports its vision, it will only be done through the "complicated interactions between what appears possible, what is thought desirable, and what is done" (Clark, 1970/1992, p. 236) by the women and men who struggle each day to build a new and distinctive university for the twenty-first century.

Sarason (1972) concludes his discussion of the creation of settings with this observation:

> It is hard to accept the fact that the more you know the more you need to know and that it is an endless process that does not end in a utopia. There will always be problems. This is the consequence of all new knowledge just as it should be part of the perceived reality of all those who create settings today and dream of future societies. (p. 284)

The process of culture formation at California State University, Monterey Bay is a dynamic and fluid struggle to identify, acknowledge, define, and solve problems. As a faculty member says: "We all must be willing to learn new things." The president tells the faculty: "We are evolving an organization that cares for each other. Weave a fabric where people know how to get to each other." It is organizational learning situated in an evolving community - a dynamic process of creating a collective identity and of people coming to a new sense of self within that collectivity. It involves translating values into behaviors. Legacies remain, and struggles continue. For the people who drink the water and risk their hair glowing in the dark, for those involved in making values real, it is an endless process, and there will always be problems.

More Questions

This study also seems an endless process of increasing conceptually complexity with few answers and many more questions.

1. Are we prisoners of our cultures, trapped in the box? Can people understand the pervasive effects of social, historical, political, economic, and organizational contexts on culture formation? There are photographs of the planning faculty members in the meeting area of the academic affairs module showing each of them behind the iron bars of the window in the vault of this former munitions warehouse. Invisible bars create prisons not necessarily of our own making: defensive cultural barriers to change.

2. What is the effect of an imagined future on the present? The pull of a vision of a better future is compelling and engages the hopes and dreams of people. People are cultural beings who act in the present and in a context imbued with the past. How do people maintain balance on this tightrope? What does it take for people to challenge and overcome the assumed validity of what is - in order to create something new?

3. In what ways do a person's cultural and personal understanding of time influence interpretation and meaning? Meaning making has a temporal dimension, and time is not the same for everyone. For some it is linear, divisible, and finite, and for others time is circular or ephemeral. How do people who see in the here and now and people whose vision is inclusive of both the past and distant futures learn to communicate and work together?

4. Who develops ownership in the enterprise? How do people deal with aloneness and alienation in the context of community? When the personal and professional consequences of failure are unacceptable, can people trust each other and invest themselves in the organization? How does an organization build a collective identity that values all voices and lessens distinctions between important people and not so important people?

5. How do people respond to unanticipated problems and the effects of unexamined values and ideologies which create organizational craziness when enthusiasm and hope meet conflict and disillusionment? Can we take away the blame? What will it take for people "to work together to build a good community here that will enable us all to take risks and come out okay"?

Postscript

More than six months have past since this paper was first prepared for my research practicum at UCLA. New faculty, students, and more staff have arrived at CSUMB. The physical space is being transformed on a daily basis from a fort to a campus. President Clinton dedicated the university on Labor Day. Questions and problems persist, and the cover of the catalog is aptly inscribed: "A Work in Progress."

References

Austin, A. (1992). Faculty culture. In B. R. Clark, & G. Neave (Eds.), The Encyclopedia of Higher Education, 3, pp. 1614-1622. New York: Pergamon Press.

Becher, T. (1989). Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual inquiry and the cultures of the disciplines. Milton Keynes, United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Benjamin, R., & Carroll, S. (1993). Restructuring higher education - by design. RAND Institute on Education and Training, 2, 1-6. (Available from RAND, P.O. Box 2138, Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138).

Bennis, W. G., & Slater, P. E. (1968). The temporary society. New York: Harper & Row.

Bergquist, W. H. (1992). The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bok, D. (1990). Universities and the future of America. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). Homo academicus (P. Collier, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published in 1984)

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cameron, K. S., & Ettington, D. R. (1989). The conceptual foundations of organizational culture. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, Vol. IV (pp. 356-396). New York: Agathon Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Tschirhart, M. (1992). Postindustrial environments and organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities. Journal of Higher Education, 63 (1), 87-108.

Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1984). Models of the organizational life cycle: Applications to higher education. In J. L. Bess (Ed.), College and university

organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences (pp. 31-61). New York: New York University Press.

Cardozier, V. R. (Ed.). (1993). Important lessons from innovative colleges and universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). Collegiate culture and leadership strategies. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Clark, B. R. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 178-184.

Clark, B. R. (1987a). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. Princeton, N. J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, B. R. (Ed.). (1987b). The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, B. R. (1992). The distinctive college (new ed.) New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction. (Original work published in 1970)

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president (2nd ed.). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Curry, B. K. (1992). Instituting enduring innovations: Achieving continuity of change in higher education. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7) Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Dill, D. D. (1982). The management of academic culture: Notes on the management of meaning and social integration. Higher Education, 11, 303-320.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48, 147-160.

Drucker, P. F. (1989). The new realities: In government and politics, in economics and business, in society and world view. New York: Harper & Row.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K. (1992). Organization theory in the postmodern era. In M. Reed & M. Hughes (Eds.), Rethinking organization. London: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1979). Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grant, G., & Riesman, D. (1978). The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. Academy of Management Review, 18 (4), 657-693.

Heydinger, R. B. (1994). A reinvented model for higher education. On the horizon, the environmental scanning newsletter for leaders in education, 3 (1), 1-5. (Available from James L. Morrison, Editor, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, CB#3500 Peabody Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599)

Kerr, C. (1963). The uses of the university. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, C. (1991). The great transformation in higher education, 1960-1980. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kimberly, J. R. (1980). Initiation, innovation, and institutionalization in the creation process. In J. R. Kimberly, R. H. Miles, & Associates, The organizational life cycle: Issues in the creation, transformation, and decline of organizations (pp. 18-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1) Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Lave, J. (1991). Situated learning in communities of practice. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.). Perspectives on socially shared cognition (pp. 63-82). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Levine, A. (1980). Why innovation fails: The institutionalization and termination of innovation in higher education. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. (Ed.). (1985). Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

MacDonald, G. B. (Ed.). (1972). Five experimental colleges: Bensalem, Antioch-Putney, Franconia, Old Westbury, Fairhaven. New York: Harper & Row.

Marchese, T. (1995, May/June). "It's the system, Stupid." Change, 27, 4.

Metzger, W. P. (1987). The academic profession in the United States. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meyer, J., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In J. Meyer & W. R. Scott, Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Miles, R. H. (1980). Findings and implications of organizational life cycle research: A commencement. In J. R. Kimberly, R. H. Miles, & Associates, The organizational life cycle: Issues in the creation, transformation, and decline of organizations (pp. 430-450). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, R. H., & Randolph, W. A. (1980). Influence of organizational learning styles on early development. In J. R. Kimberly, R. H. Miles, & Associates, The organizational life cycle: Issues in the creation, transformation, and decline of organizations (pp. 44-82). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ouchi, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1985). Organizational culture. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 457-483.

Martin, J. (1992). Cultures in organizations. New York: Oxford University Press.

Munitz, B. (1993, May). Charter campuses - a new direction in management. The CSU Academic Senator. (Available from Academic Senate CSU, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 134, Long Beach, CA 90802-4275).

Munitz, B. (1995, April 10). Transforming education: The university of the 21st century. Presentation at the annual meeting of the National University Continuing Education Association, Anaheim, CA.

Pondy, L. R., Frost, P. J., Morgan, G., & Dandridge, T. C. (Eds.). (1983). Organizational symbolism. Monographs in Organizational Behavior and Industrial Relations, 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Rhoads, R. A., & Tierney, W. G. (1992). Cultural leadership in higher education. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, National Center on

Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 357 708)

Riesman, D., Gusfield, J., & Gamson, Z. (1970). Academic values and mass education: The early years of Oakland and Monteith. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.

Sarason, S. B. (1972). The creation of settings and the future societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. B. (1974). The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. Organizational Dynamics, 12, 13-28.

Schein, E. H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. American Psychologist, 45 (2), 109-119.

Schwartzman, H. B. (1993). Ethnography in organizations. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Scott, W. R. (1992). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tierney, W. G. (1988a). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. Journal of Higher Education, 59 (1), 2-21.

Tierney, W. G. (1988b). The web of leadership: The presidency in higher education. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Curricular landscapes, democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education. New York: Praeger.

Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). (1991). Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda. New York: Praeger.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). Building communities of difference: Higher education in the 21st century. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Tierney, W. G., & Rhoads, R. A. (1993). Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 93-6) Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Townsend, B. K., Newell, L. J., & Wiese, M. D. (1992). Creating distinctiveness: Lessons from uncommon colleges and universities. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6) Washington, D. C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 1-19.

Weiland, S. (1995). "Belonging to romanticism": Discipline, specialty, and academic identity. The Review of Higher Education, 18 (3), 265-292.

Appendix: The CSUMB Vision Statement

California State University, Monterey Bay

Vision Statement

California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) is envisioned as a comprehensive state university which values service through high-quality education. The campus will be distinctive in serving the diverse people of California, especially the working class and historically under-educated and low-income populations. It will feature an enriched living and learning environment and year-round operation. The identity of the University will be framed by substantive commitment to a multilingual, multicultural, intellectual community distinguished by partnerships with existing institutions, both public and private, and by cooperative agreements which enable students, faculty, and staff to cross institutional boundaries for innovative instruction, broadly defined scholarly and creative activity, and coordinated community service.

The University will invest in preparation for the future through integrated and experimental use of technologies as resources to people, catalysts for learning, and providers of increased access and enriched quality learning. The curricula of CSUMB will be student and society-centered and of sufficient breadth and depth to meet statewide and regional needs, specifically those involving both inner city and isolated rural populations (Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito). The programs of instruction will strive for distinction, building on regional assets in developing specialty clusters in such areas as the sciences (marine, atmospheric, and environmental); visual and performing arts and related humanities; language, culture, and international studies; education; business; studies of human behavior, information, and communication, within broad curricular areas; and professional study.

The University will develop a culture of innovation in its overall conceptual design and organization, and will utilize new and varied pedagogical and instructional approaches including distance learning. Institutional programs will value and cultivate creative and productive talents of students, faculty, and staff, and seek ways to contribute to the economy of the state, the well-being of our communities, and the quality of life and development of its students, faculty, and service areas.

The education programs at CSUMB will:

- integrate the sciences and the arts and humanities, liberal studies and professional training;
- integrate modern learning technology and pedagogy to create liberal education adequate for the contemporary world;
- integrate work and learning, service and reflection;
- recognize the importance of global interdependence;
- invest in languages and cross-cultural competence; and
- emphasize those topics most central to the local area's economy and accessible residential learning environment.

The University will provide a new model of organizing, managing, and financing higher education:

- The University will be integrated with other institutions, essentially collaborative in its orientation, and active in seeking partnerships across institutional boundaries. It will develop and implement various arrangements for sharing courses, curriculum, faculty, students, and facilities with other institutions.
- The organizational structure of the University will reflect a belief in the importance of each administrative staff and faculty member, working to integrate the university community across "staff" and "faculty" lines.

The financial aid system will emphasize a fundamental commitment to equity and access.

- The budget and financial systems, including student fees, will provide for efficient and effective operation of the University.
- University governance will be exercised with a substantial amount of autonomy and independence within a very broad CSU system-wide policy context.

Accountability will emphasize careful evaluation and assessment of results and student learning goals.

Our vision of the goals of California State University, Monterey Bay includes a model, pluralistic, academic community where all learn and teach one another in an atmosphere of mutual respect and pursuit of excellence; a faculty and staff motivated to excel in their respective fields as well as contributing to the broadly defined university environment. Our graduates will have an understanding of interdependence and global competence, distinctive technical and educational skills, the experience and abilities to contribute to California's high-quality work force, the critical thinking abilities to be productive citizens, and the social responsibility and skills to be community builders. CSUMB will dynamically link the past, present, and future by responding to historical and changing conditions, experimenting with strategies which increase access, improving quality, and lowering costs through education in a distinctive CSU environment. University students and personnel will attempt analytically and creatively to meet critical state and regional needs and to provide California with responsible and creative leadership for the global 21st century.

September 27, 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE